

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1209(a)(2) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking out all beginning with "Provided, however" through "Provided further" and inserting in lieu thereof "Provided"; and

(2) in the second sentence by striking out all beginning with "Provided, however" through "And provided further" and insert in lieu thereof "Provided".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable to war risk insurance coverage attaching after the date of enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, in World War I, World War II, and in the Korean war the Government recognized that commercial insurance would be terminated in event of major war and that a system of Government-supported insurance was necessary to keep vessels of private maritime interests at sea in time of such extreme crises.

The purpose of this bill is to accord to U.S. citizen-owners of vessels built in U.S. shipyards with construction subsidy the same rights with respect to war risk insurance coverage of their vessels as now are accorded to American and foreign owners of unsubsidized vessels. Existing statutes deny to American owners of subsidized vessels this equality of war risk coverage, even though such owners are required by the Maritime Administrator to carry insurance in peacetime to the full commercial value of their vessels as determined by the Administrator. This measure would provide for the owners of such subsidized vessels the right to purchase equal insurance coverage, free of any restriction placed upon them solely because of a Government subsidy which goes to the shipyards without benefit to the owners. As the war risk insurance program is operated on a mutual basis, the increased coverage sought should not entail any extra costs to the Government.

The situation is fully explained in the committee report.

The need for the legislation arises out of the fact that a number of years ago provision was made in the law to the effect that vessels built with construction subsidy could be seized by the Government in event of all-out war at the depreciated cost to the operator on the theory that the Government had contributed a substantial portion to the cost of building the ship in American shipyards—that is, on account of the construction-differential subsidy. The law, as it exists, overlooks the fact that the hard core of the American flag merchant marine, the ships that will perform most efficiently and with the greatest safety—the lowest incidence of loss—are these very ships. If any of them should be lost they are the ones we want most of all to be replaced promptly.

They should, in the opinion of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, receive equal treatment as to war risk insurance valuations with any other American flag ship and the many

foreign flag ships which under existing law are permitted to insure at market value—rather than at some greatly reduced value based upon an artificial standard.

It should be pointed out that in peacetime these vessels are required to carry full-value marine insurance—not restricted by a rigid formula. The operator is full owner of the ship, notwithstanding the subsidy paid to the shipyard. He owns his ship as much as does the unsubsidized American flag owner or the citizen-owner of a foreign flag ship.

Any indemnities received by the subsidized operator under existing law or under this bill must go into the statutory capital reserve fund to be used for ship replacement. Your committee's report urges that any such indemnities in excess of the American-foreign differential be offset against construction subsidy otherwise allowable for a replacement ship.

The committee report points out that there should be no cost to the Government in this bill.

Under existing law—and its regulations—a binder fee is paid. But during the early period of hostilities the premiums are based on actual losses—averaged out. From then on premium costs are either averaged out on the basis of experience or estimated on the basis of risk. Experience in the past has borne this out. War risk insurance had in World War II left a substantial gain to the Government after all losses were paid.

There is no reason for any treatment of subsidized vessels different from unsubsidized American and foreign vessels for war risk insurance purposes. Enactment of this bill could reduce construction subsidy costs and speed rebuilding of our liner fleet following major hostilities.

[Mr. TOLLEFSON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PROVIDING FOR AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY TO DETERMINE A SITE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SEA LEVEL CANAL CONNECTING THE ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC OCEANS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2701) to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It is my understanding that the Rayburn Office Building was constructed under a type of

study similar to this. Is there anything in this bill which would indicate that they could proceed with the building of a canal under the \$17.5 million authorization?

Mr. BONNER. None whatsoever. I might clarify this. In the past administration, when the gentleman from Washington was acting chairman of the committee, we selected a group of experts to go to Panama and make a study of the possibility of a sea level canal. It was a most interesting study. They made certain recommendations.

In the hearings on this bill in the House the committee amended the bill because the Senate bill set forth who would be on the Commission—for instance, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of State, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. We struck those names out and gave the President authority to appoint five men. Of course, they must operate with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Army and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, because the State Department will have to negotiate with nations where the on-the-ground experiments are to take place, the borings and so forth.

The gentleman will notice in the hearings that the committee requires the Commission to make annual reports.

So you point out the figure of \$14 million to \$17 million. It is not anticipated that that would be appropriated in a lump sum immediately after the first year's report, but such moneys as are needed by the Atomic Energy Commission and by the Army Engineers and others would be appropriated as this study progresses. In other words, as far as the borings are concerned, this is something that is going to take very, very careful exploration to determine whether it is possible to put a sea level canal across the isthmus or any other adjacent country. This is pointed out for the reason of the disturbance that might take place under the ocean. I think the gentlemen from Washington [Mr. PELLY and Mr. TOLLEFSON] can assure you that we have taken great care in this bill to amend it so that every precaution will be in the bill to eliminate any unnecessary spending. We have to determine now whether it is feasible to do this.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say to the gentleman that I am just an average Member of Congress, but it seems to me \$17.5 million is a lot of money to spend just to determine if it is feasible.

Mr. BONNER. I can appreciate the gentleman's point, and I admire him for his interest.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The necessity for this legislation arises from the fact that the experience with the present canal indicates, No. 1, it has been a trouble spot in the last year or so, of course, but further than that, it is estimated within a very few years the canal cannot handle the traffic, which will increase as the years pass by. So there is going to be a need for another canal or an expansion of the present canal.

Our committee feels an expansion of the present canal might aggravate the troubles we have had there. We would like to have a survey made to determine whether or not it will be advisable and feasible to have another canal at another point. The surveys and studies necessary and preliminary to the building of this canal will take about 5 years. It is estimated at the end of this time the present canal will not carry the load. So all this bill provides for is the authority for the President to appoint a commission to make a survey, and the estimated cost for surveys and borings and drillings, but not construction, might come to some \$17 million. It is a fact, of course, that no funds can be expended until the commission comes before the Committee on Appropriations and spells out how much money it is going to need and what the money will be spent for.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say to the gentleman from Washington there is nothing in the 10-page report that would indicate anything more than the statement of Mr. Seaborg and others that they need \$17 million. There is very little supporting evidence. I assume your committee looked into it, but as a Member of Congress I see little supporting evidence for spending \$17.5 million.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The hearings, of course, contain much more evidence than the report indicates. Some of the estimates ran higher, but we felt those higher estimates were out of line, and the estimate of \$14 million to \$17 million could be justified.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CLAIMS OF U.S. NATIONALS AGAINST CUBA

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12259) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is the agreed bill that was worked out, is it not?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman from Ohio is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And this bill was reported out unanimously, is that correct?

Mr. FASCELL. That is correct.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12259, a bill which calls for the determination of claims of U.S. nationals against the Government of Cuba.

This legislation is one of a series of measures considered by the Congress in the past with respect to claims of nationals of the United States whose property has been taken by Communist governments since the end of World War II.

The enactment of the International Claims Settlement Act, as amended, resulted from violations by Communist governments with respect to the treatment of property owned by American citizens in those countries and the failure to compensate these owners.

The Castro government in Cuba, on and after January 1, 1959, expropriated and nationalized all properties owned by nationals of the United States in violation of the principles of international law. Compensation has not been provided for nationals of the United States, either as private individuals or corporate entities.

The purpose of H.R. 12259 is to provide, in accordance with the principles of international law, for the adjudication of claims of U.S. nationals which are based upon the nationalization, expropriation, intervention, or other taking of their property and special measures directed against their property by the Government of Cuba since January 1, 1959, and for the adjudication of all claims against the Government of Cuba which have arisen since January 1, 1959, for disability or death of U.S. nationals for which the Government of Cuba is responsible under principles of international law.

The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am chairman, held hearings on a bill, H.R. 10327, introduced by the gentleman from Florida, Representative FASCELL, and identical bills introduced by the gentleman from Florida, Representative CRAMER, and the gentleman from Florida, Representative PEPPER, H.R. 10536 and H.R. 10720, respectively. In addition to adjudication provisions, these measures also called for the payment of claims from blocked Cuban Government assets, and provided for loans to claimants under the Alliance for Progress program, using as collateral the uncompensated portion of their approved claims.

The subcommittee heard many private witnesses whose property and enterprises were taken by Castro's government, in connection with this legislation. It also heard the sponsor of H.R. 10327, the gentleman from Florida, Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL; the sponsor of H.R. 10720, the gentleman from Florida, Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER; and representatives of the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and the Department of Commerce. After weighing carefully the testimony presented to it, and taking into account important foreign policy considerations, the subcommittee approved the provisions of identical claims bills, H.R. 12259 and H.R. 12260, introduced by the gentleman from Florida, Representative FASCELL, and me, respectively. These bills provide only for the adjudication of claims of U.S. nationals against the Government of Cuba. The Committee on Foreign Affairs considered H.R. 12259 and on August 11, unanimously ordered it favorably reported.

I might mention here that all claims programs do not necessarily involve payment. The Foreign Claims Settlement

Commission is presently administering a program where the purpose is to determine the amount of damages suffered by certain American citizens who own property on the southern shores of Lake Ontario. In the Lake Ontario program there is no provision made for payment, and it might also, therefore, be termed a program of adjudication.

It is estimated that 4,000 U.S. nationals have claims against the Government of Cuba totaling more than \$1.5 billion. H.R. 12259 adds a new title V to the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, providing for the adjudication of these claims by American citizens against the Government of Cuba, arising since January 1, 1959.

The nationality requirements of claimants under the bill are similar to those under other titles of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, and the claims must have been continuously owned by nationals of the United States from the date of loss. This provision follows established international law principles which, when applicable, have been applied in all adjudications before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

The purpose of establishment of adjudication procedures is to evaluate claims now, while records and witnesses are still available. The bill contains no provision relating to any decision as to the time, form, or manner of payment of eventual compensation. It does not affect the validity of claims which arose prior to January 1, 1959.

The Department of State has been the recipient of all records and documents relating to claims against Cuba. Upon enactment of this measure these records and documents will be turned over to the Commission for use in evaluating claims. Prompt adjudication by the Claims Commission will help all U.S. claimants organize the evidence needed and preserve the statements of witnesses who may disperse or die as time goes on. The adjudication process will give each of the claims a review by the Commission which will pinpoint what additional material should be collected before it is too late to do so.

It is important that the claimants, the Congress, and the executive branch be informed of what the total of valid claims is for guidance in any future negotiations with a responsible, free and democratic Cuban Government. It will be clear just what claims are valid; the State Department as well as the entire executive branch will have an important ingredient in their planning of any future relations with Cuba; and any future Cuban Government will have a detailed written documentation of claims it must face.

In view of the need for early adjudication proceedings by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of claims against Cuba, the committee approved an authorization of funds not to exceed \$750,000 for the administrative expenses of the Commission for this purpose.

I wholeheartedly support the provision of this bill, and urge adoption by the House.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has just given us an excellent analysis of the legislation before us today, H.R. 12259.

The prompt, yet thorough, action on this legislation serves to demonstrate the outstanding knowledge and leadership which has continually marked the chairmanship of this subcommittee by my able colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN]. His keen awareness and insight into the problems of Cuba and Latin America have enabled the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Affairs to delve into and effectively act on important foreign policy questions.

While this bill provides no compensation, it will enable our citizens to formally prove their claims—looking forward to that day when Castro falls and an agreement for compensation may be worked out with a new government. So, after 5 long years, it can be called the first effective step toward obtaining compensation for our American citizens whose property was arbitrarily taken pursuant to Communist design.

Such determination and proving of claims is long overdue and as more time passes, it will become ever more difficult for claimants to locate the necessary documents and witnesses to establish their claims.

Thus far, the only available recourse open to would-be claimants is a routine filing of their losses with the Department of State. The Department estimates that these now total about \$524 million but can go as high as \$1.5 billion if all persons losing property in Cuba were to file.

This legislation makes possible a formal procedure whereby all claimants will have the opportunity to prove up their claims through the already established channels of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. This is not only good business, but good sense.

If the United States were to wait for the eventual overturn of the Castro regime before proceeding to adjudication of claims, the expense could be much greater in proving up the claims, not only to the claimants, but to the United States as well. Witnesses must be located, that is, if they are still living, records must be gathered and the time-consuming process of adjudication must begin.

One businessman who testified during the hearings on this legislation is a good case in point. All of his records were taken or destroyed by the officials of the Castro government at the time of expropriation, and only one person remained, outside of his family, who could testify to his ownership of his own knowledge. That person recently died.

When the time comes, and the Castro government has toppled, as it will, we must be prepared to offer our American citizens the protection they deserve by having proved up in this formal adjudicatory procedure the amount of their claim.

The entire program as outlined in H.R. 12259 and H.R. 12260, introduced by my able colleague from Alabama, will be extremely helpful to our State Department

in their negotiations with a new government in Cuba and will place us in a much stronger position for reaching a satisfactory agreement.

Mr. Speaker, there is another important matter to which I would like to call attention. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, when it unanimously reported this bill, stated as follows:

The committee respectfully directs the attention of the Department of State and the Agency for International Development to the opportunities for enhancing the Alliance for Progress through the use of the experience and skills acquired by some of these claimants in the course of their business operations in Cuba. Americans who were successful in foreign investments in Cuba should be encouraged to reinvest in other Latin American countries in acceptable projects under the Alliance for Progress. Private enterprise still plays the major role in carrying out the economic improvement of developing countries. Americans who are claimants have the ability and the know-how which can be useful in support of a major U.S. effort to bring about economic and social improvement in Latin America and to thwart Communist objectives.

The bill as reported by the committee contains no loan provisions as provided in H.R. 10327 and which had as a prerequisite the adjudication of claims. There now exist in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provisions for direct loans and for investment guarantees to U.S. private enterprise. The committee believes that no additional authority for loans is considered necessary in this legislation.

However, the committee suggests that the Secretary of State take into consideration the successful foreign investment experience of any qualified claimant under this legislation who may apply, under existing law, either for a loan or an investment guarantee.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to provide some 4,000 American citizens throughout the United States with the protection they deserve, we must enact H.R. 12259 which is in accordance with the principles of international law and equally important, in the interest of justice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE V

"Purpose of title

"Sec. 501. It is the purpose of this title to provide for the determination of the amount and validity of claims against the Government of Cuba which have arisen since January 1, 1959, out of nationalization, expropriation, intervention, or other takings of, or special measures directed against, property of nationals of the United States, and claims for disability or death of nationals of the United States arising out of violations of international laws by the Government of Cuba, in order to obtain information concerning the total amount of such claims against the Government of Cuba on behalf of nationals of the United States.

"Definitions

"Sec. 502. For the purposes of this title:

"(1) The term 'national of the United States' means (A) a natural person who is a citizen of the United States, or (B) a corpo-

ration or other legal entity which is organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, if natural persons who are citizens of the United States own, directly or indirectly, 50 per centum or more of the outstanding capital stock or other beneficial interest of such corporation or entity. The term does not include aliens.

"(2) The term 'Commission' means the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

"(3) The term 'property' means any property, right, or interest, including any leasehold interest, and debts owed by the Government of Cuba or by enterprises which have been nationalized, expropriated, intervened, or taken by the Government of Cuba and debts which are a charge on property which has been nationalized, expropriated, intervened, or taken by the Government of Cuba.

"(4) The term 'Government of Cuba' includes the government of any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof.

"Receipt of claims

"Sec. 503. (a) The Commission shall receive and determine in accordance with applicable substantive law, including international law, the amount and validity of claims by nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba arising since January 1, 1959, for losses resulting from the nationalization, expropriation, intervention, or other taking of, or special measures directed against, property including any rights or interests therein owned wholly or partially, directly or indirectly at the time by nationals of the United States, if such claims are submitted to the Commission within such period specified by the Commission by notice published in the Federal Register (which period shall not be more than eighteen months after such publication) within sixty days after the enactment of this title or of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under this title, whichever date is later. In making the determination with respect to the validity and amount of claims and value of properties, rights, or interests taken, the Commission shall take into account the basis of valuation most appropriate to the property and equitable to the claimant, including but not limited to, (i) fair market value, (ii) book value, (iii) going concern value, or (iv) cost of replacement.

"(b) The Commission shall receive and determine in accordance with applicable substantive law, including international law, the amount and validity of claims by nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba arising since January 1, 1959, for disability or death resulting from actions taken by or under the authority of the Government of Cuba, if such claims are submitted to the Commission within the period established by the Commission under subsection (a), or within six months after the date the claims first arose (as determined by the Commission), whichever date last occurs.

"Ownership of claims

"Sec. 504. (a) A claim shall not be considered under section 503(a) of this title unless the property on which the claim was based was owned wholly or partially, directly or indirectly by a national of the United States on the date of the loss and unless the claim has been held by one or more nationals of the United States continuously thereafter until the date of filing with the Commission.

"(b) A claim for disability shall not be considered under section 503(b) of this title unless filed by or on behalf of the disabled person. A claim for death under such section shall not be considered unless filed by or on behalf of the widow or widower, child or parents of the deceased person.

"Corporate claims"

"Sec. 505. (a) A claim under section 503(a) of this title based upon an ownership interest in any corporation, association, or other entity which is a national of the United States shall not be considered.

"(b) A claim under section 503(a) of this title based upon a direct ownership interest in a corporation, association, or other entity for loss shall be considered, subject to the other provisions of this title, if such corporation, association, or other entity on the date of the loss was not a national of the United States, without regard to the percentage of ownership vested in the claimant.

"(c) A claim under section 503(a) of this title based upon an indirect ownership interest in a corporation, association, or other entity for loss shall be considered, subject to the other provisions of this title, only if at least 25 per centum of the entire ownership interest thereof at the time of such loss was vested in nationals of the United States.

"(d) The amount of any claim covered by subsection (b) or (c) of this section shall be calculated on the basis of the total loss suffered by such corporation, association, or other entity, and shall bear the same proportion to such loss as the ownership interest of the claimant at the time of loss bears to the entire ownership interest thereof.

"Offsets"

"Sec. 506. In determining the amount of any claim, the Commission shall deduct all amounts the claimant has received from any source on account of the same loss or losses.

"Action of Commission with respect to claims"

"Sec. 507. The Commission shall certify to each individual who has filed a claim under this title the amount determined by the Commission to be the loss or damage suffered by the claimant which is covered by this title. The Commission shall certify to the Secretary of State such amount and the basic information underlying that amount.

"Transfer of records"

"Sec. 508. The Secretary of State shall transfer or otherwise make available to the Commission such records and documents relating to claims authorized by this as may be required by the Commission in carrying out its functions under this title.

"Application of other laws"

"Sec. 509. To the extent they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, the following provisions of title I of this Act shall be applicable to this title: Subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (h), and (j) of section 4; subsection (f) of section 7.

"Settlement period"

"Sec. 510. The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims pursuant to this title not later than three years following the final date for the filing of claims as provided in section 503(a) of this title or following the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under this title, whichever date is later.

"Appropriations"

"Sec. 511. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$750,000, as may be necessary to enable the Commission to pay its administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under this title.

"Separability"

"Sec. 512. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks following the passage of the bill S. 927, and my remarks on the bill S. 2701.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 11296, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1965, have until midnight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1781)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 23, 24, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 191, 210, and 214.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 17, 22, 195, 196, 203, 205, 206, 211, and 218, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$75,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", and not to exceed \$14,500,000 shall be available for management expenses for civil defense including not to exceed 1,000 positions"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$30,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters except in construction of new buildings under the heading, "Construction, Public Buildings Projects", for the fiscal year 1965."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,607,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,358,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$82,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,996,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$273,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "fourteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: